From: Jessica Winter
To: Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: Flood rise analysis proposal from LWG
Date: 04/02/2010 01:47 PM

Hi Chip and Eric,
From my perspective, EFDC would be a good choice because it would be compatible with the hydro modeling that's already been done on the site and because it would offer 2D rather than 1D analysis. My question would be: how is what they are proposing to do here different from section 5.1 of the Phase 2 Hydro/Sed Modeling Report (in which the EFDC was used to simulate the 1996 ~100-year flood)? Comments on that approach were as follows:
1. the erosion rate adjustment factors (WRSPADJ) that decrease the predicted scour depths should not be used (they were used in the deeper layers of sediment below 30 cm)
2. flow hydrograph instead of radiation-separation boundary condition should be used at upstream end
Additionally, that approach used a large grain size for the soil/sediment in overbank areas so that there no erosion would occur but deposition was possible. Will this flood rise analysis look at bank erosion?
And there was some trouble matching modeled water surface elevations to observations, which was thought to have been due to the Columbia River elevation measurements that were used as inputs to the model being too high. This resulted in slower flows on the Willamette. LWG should seek out accurate water surface elevation data to use in the proposed flood rise analysis.

Earl mentioned EFDC being used at multiple other sites- one other I'm aware of is the Housatonic River in Massachusetts. They used it for flood rise simulations there and as I understand it, the problem they ran into was that they used so many grid cells to represent the floodplain that the model took an extremely long time to run. That was possibly partially because they were coupling it with a PCB transport model as well, so we should have better results. The grid that was used in the 100-year flood simulation might work well, or LWG may have modifications in mind.

Feel free to call or email me if there are questions on anything I've said.
-Jessica

--
Jessica Winter
NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 1
Seattle, WA 98115
Phone (206) 526-4540
Fax (206) 526-6665
jessica.winter@noaa.gov

Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
> Modeling issue #2
>
> The LWG is interested in using the EFDC model to run flood rise
> simulations instead of the HEC-RAS model that we previously recommended.
> The LWG's brief write-up on use of EFDC for this purpose & its
> advantages vs HEC-RAS are in Carl's email below. We are interested in
> any feedback from those familiar with these models so we can advise the
> LWG on how to proceed.
>
> Also, please note that while this description indicates it would be used
> in remedial design, it is our expectation that flood rise potential will
> be addressed in the FS as well.
>
> thanks
> Chip
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Forwarded by Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US on 04/01/2010 03:35 PM
> -----
>
>
>
>   RE: Flood analysis
>
>
>   Carl Stivers
>   to:
>   Chip Humphrey
>   04/01/2010 03:33 PM
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Chip -
>
>
> Regarding how we would use the EFDC model and why:

> As part of the remedial design for the areas of potential concern (AOPCs), it is necessary to analyze the effects that proposed changes in bathymetry have on river stage height. This analysis is typically conducted using a one-dimensional hydrodynamic model that predicts stage height changes caused by changes in the cross-sectional area of the river. For the Lower Willamette River (LWR), a two-dimensional hydrodynamic model already exists and it is based on the Environmental Fluid Dynamics Code (EFDC) framework (Hamrick 1992). This model has been calibrated and validated for the LWR and deemed reliable for evaluating its hydrodynamic behavior. Therefore, we propose to use this model to analyze the potential effects of proposed remedial alternatives on stage height during flood events.
>
> EFDC is a modeling framework capable of performing two- or three-dimensional hydrodynamic simulations and it has been approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This model has been successfully applied in numerous hydrodynamic, sediment transport, and chemical fate studies. Using this framework, a two-dimensional, vertically-averaged model of the LWR has been developed by the Lower Willamette Group (LWG). The model domain extends from Willamette Falls to the confluence with the Columbia River. This model has been calibrated to measured water stage heights and current velocities collected at several locations. The model is currently being used for the RI/FS study of the LWR, with the hydrodynamic results being used to drive sediment transport and chemical fate models.
>
> This hydrodynamic model is sufficiently reliable for analyzing the effects of bathymetry changes on river stage height. Thus, development, calibration and application of a one-dimensional hydrodynamic model are not necessary. Most importantly, the predictions of the two-dimensional model will be at least as accurate, and probably more accurate, than a one-dimensional model, mainly because the two-dimensional model provides a more realistic representation of the geometry and bathymetry of the LWR. This characteristic of the two-dimensional model makes it possible to simulate recirculation patterns and backwater effects that locally modify river stage height, which are small spatial scale features that are not captured by a one-dimensional model. Therefore, there is no need to develop a new one-dimensional model of the LWR that will, at best, provide the same results as the existing two-dimensional model.
>
> Reference
>
> Hamrick, J.M. 1992. A Three-Dimensional Environmental Fluid Dynamics Computer Code: Theoretical and Computational Aspects. College of William and Mary, Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences. Special Report 317. 63 pp.
>
> Regarding Reasons Why We Want to Use EFDC:
>
> Per the above EFDC will be more accurate and capture smaller scale features than developing a new 1-D HEC-RAS model. Also, given that the EFDC model is all set up and calibrated, there will be very little additional time to run the flooding simulations. In contrast, if we use HEC-RAS we will have to parameterize, troubleshoot, and calibrate an entirely new model for the river. We are completely familiar with HEC-RAS and its various uses, but even so, it will take significant additional time (and cost) to develop and calibrate an entirely new model. We do not need to purchase the model software (we already have it). None the less, the labor effort associated with developing and calibrating an entirely new model for the site are significant and we estimate in the range of $40 to $50K in labor costs. Given that EFDC will be both more accurate and cost less to use, the LWG prefers the use of EFDC for this purpose.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Carl
>
> Carl Stivers
>
> ANCHOR QEA, LLC
>
> cstivers@anchorqea.com
>
> 23 S. Wenatchee Ave, Suite 120
>
> Wenatchee, WA 98801
>
> Phone: 509.888.2070

> Fax: 509.888.2211
>
>
>
>
>
> ANCHOR QEA, LLC
>
> www.anchorqea.com
>
> Please consider the environment before printing this email.
>
> This electronic message transmission contains information that may be
> confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of
> litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual
> or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
> aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents
> of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic
> transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov [
> mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]
> Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2010 3:03 PM
> To: Carl Stivers
> Subject: RE: Flood analysis
>
> Carl
>
> Can you send me a short description of how you would intend to use the
>
> ERDC model in lieu of the HEC RAS model for predicting flood rise as
>
> part of the FS & reasons why (including the cost savings of not having
>
> to purchase the software) you want us to consider this?   I need to send
>
> it around and want to make sure I capture your perspective correctly.
>
> If you've already provided something just point me to it.
>
> thanks
>
> Chip
>